IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

PATRICK EMMETT,   §
    ID # 01383329,   §
       Plaintiff,   §
                                §
v.   §   No. 3:25-CV-0344-D-BW
                                §
TEXAS STATE GOVERNOR, et al.,   §
       Defendants.   §

ORDER

I

After reviewing all relevant matters of record in this case, including the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge and plaintiff's objections thereto, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the court is of the opinion that the findings and conclusions of the magistrate judge are correct, and they are adopted as the findings and conclusions of the court. For the reasons stated in the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, plaintiff's letter motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, received on February 12, 2025 (Dkt. No. 4), is denied. By separate judgment, the court will summarily dismiss this action as barred by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

II

Further, plaintiff is hereby barred from filing future actions in this or any other federal court without first obtaining leave of court to do so, and any case in which he is a plaintiff that is filed, removed, or transferred without payment of the applicable filing fees will not be reviewed by the court. To obtain leave to file in this court, plaintiff must file an "Application Pursuant to Court Order Seeking Leave to File," with a copy of the proposed complaint, and certify that: (1) the claim or claims presented have never been raised and disposed of on the merits by any federal court; and (2) the claim or claims are not frivolous or taken in bad faith. Any application

seeking leave to file in this court must either cite to or attach a copy of this order.

<div align="center">III</div>

Plaintiff's March 25, 2025 motion for leave to file sanctions and objections is denied. In particular, the court discerns no justification for a 60-day extension to pay the filing fee when it is unlikely that he can ever pay the filing fee. *See* Dkt. No. 4. And to the extent that the motion includes objections to the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendation, the court overrules them.

SO ORDERED.

April 7, 2025.

_____
SIDNEY A. FITZWATER
SENIOR JUDGE